



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,322	02/26/2004	Shoichi Ando	12052.33USD1	9419

7590 02/25/2009  
Hamre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902-0902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

EXAMINER
----------

ZHU, WEIPING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1793

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/25/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/789,322	Applicant(s) ANDO ET AL.	
	Examiner WEIPING ZHU	Art Unit 1793	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) WEIPING ZHU. (3) Alex King.

(2) Curtis B. Hamre. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 19 February 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: JP 61-129246, Tomioka et al. (US 3,532,560), Bach et al. (US 4,704,166) and JP 07-097656.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant argues that JP ('246) does not disclose the claimed microstructures and Tomioka et al. ('560) teaches that pearlite structure is undesirable. The examiner maintained his positions as stated in the final rejection.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Weiping Zhu/  
 Examiner, Art Unit 1793